## United States Court of Appeals

For the Fighth Circuit

| Jut the Ci   | կյույ Վուաս                             |
|--|---|
| No. 18   | 8-3209                                  |
| United State   | es of America                           |
| P  | laintiff - Appellee                     |
| 7  | v.                                      |
| Maria Esther C   | Carrillo-Varelas                        |
| Dej  | fendant - Appellant                     |
| Appeal from United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas - Fayetteville |   |
| Filed: Jul   | June 27, 2019<br>ly 1, 2019<br>plished] |
| Before KELLY, BOWMAN, and GRASZ  | Z, Circuit Judges.                      |
| PER CURIAM.  |   |
| Maria Esther Carrillo-Varelas direc  | etly anneals after she nled quilt       |

Maria Esther Carrillo-Varelas directly appeals after she pled guilty to a drugtrafficking offense, and the district court<sup>1</sup> sentenced her to a prison term below the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Timothy L. Brooks, United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas.

calculated United States Sentencing Commission Guidelines Manual ("Guidelines") range. Her counsel has filed a brief under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), challenging the district court's application of two Guidelines enhancements, one for maintaining a premises for the purpose of distributing a controlled substance, and the other for possessing a dangerous weapon during a drug-trafficking offense.

After careful review of the record, we conclude that the enhancements were properly applied, as they were not based on clearly erroneous findings. *See United States v. Miller*, 698 F.3d 699, 705 (8th Cir. 2012) (noting whether the defendant maintained a premises for the purpose of distributing a controlled substance is a factual finding reviewed for clear error); *United States v. Atkins*, 250 F.3d 1203, 1213 (8th Cir. 2001) (noting whether the defendant possessed a firearm during a drug-trafficking offense is a factual finding reviewed for clear error). We have also independently reviewed the record under *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75 (1988), and have found no non-frivolous issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm.

-2-